

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 10, 2008. Claims 1-66 and 68 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66 and 68. The present Response amends claims 1, 18, 34, and 50 and adds new claim 69, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66, and 68. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

A. Phone Interview

A phone interview was conducted on January 9, 2009, between Examiner John M. Heffington and Patent Agent Kuiran (Ted) Liu (#60,039). Claims 1 and 69 were discussed with no agreement reached.

B. Claims Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-13, 17, 22, 24, 34, 39, 41-45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 58, 59, 60-62, and 66 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Geary (Graphic Java) in view of Graham (The HTML Sourcebook Second Edition A Complete Guide to HTML 3.0).

Claims 3, 40, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary (Graphic Java) in view of Graham (The HTML Sourcebook Second Edition A Complete Guide to HTML 3.0) and further in view of Haefel (Enterprise Java Beans).

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19-21, 25-29, 33, 35-38, 54, 55, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary in view of Graham (The HTML Sourcebook Second Edition A Complete Guide to HTML 3.0) and further in view of Schildt (Java 2, The Complete Reference).

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary (Graphic Java) in view of Graham (The HTML Sourcebook Second Edition A Complete Guide to HTML 3.0) and Schildt (Java 2, The Complete Reference) and further in view of Haefel (Enterprise Java Beans).

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary (Graphic Java) in view of Graham (The HTML Sourcebook Second Edition A Complete Guide

to HTML 3.0) and Schildt (Java 2, The Complete Reference) and further in view of Zalka (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Claims 14, 15, 16, 46-48, 63, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geary (Graphic Java) in view of Graham (The HTML Sourcebook Second Edition A Complete Guide to HTML 3.0) and further in view of Zalka (US 2004/0056894 A1).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to further state the portlet as *“a self-contained application implemented on one or more web servers.”*

Applicant respectfully submits that Geary and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 69

Claim 69 includes a feature of *“generating the logical hierarchy with the set of objects using metadata and tag extensions, wherein the meta data is created based on one or more definitions in a page description language, wherein the meta data includes the hierarchy of objects and also information about properties, events, and model binding that have values set in page descriptions, and wherein the tag extensions associated with the page description language are mapped into the logical hierarchy during render lifecycle of the logical hierarchy.”*

Applicant respectfully submits that Geary and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 69, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 34 and 50

Claims 18, 34 and 50, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 69 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-17, 19-33, 35-49, 51-66 and 68

Claims 2-17, 19-33, 35-49, 51-66 and 68 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

C. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 12, 2009

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800